

REMARKS

Claim 7 has been amended herein and claim 16 has been canceled. Reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments to the claims and remarks provided below is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

Claims 7-8 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Takai et al. (US6417426) in view of Gibes et al. (US6380292). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 7 recites:

A material comprising: 1) a first surface and a second surface opposite the first surface, the second surface forming a body facing surface 2) *an adhesive composition disposed in a pattern on the first surface of the material*, 3) a plurality of apertures *in an area of said material not patterned with adhesive*, and 4) *flocked fibers applied to said adhesive composition*, wherein said apertures originate in the second surface of the material and extend from said first surface to said second surface, and wherein said apertures are structured and arranged such that sides walls of said apertures protrude away from the second surface and project outward from said first surface. (Emphasis Added)

Thus the material according to amended claim 7 includes, in part, an adhesive disposed on a first surface of the material, a plurality of apertures that are arranged *in an area not patterned with the adhesive, and flocked fibers applied to said adhesive composition*. Thus, the flocked fibers are not arranged in the area of the film with the apertures.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Takai et al. or Gibes disclose such a structure. Takai et al. at Figure 3 and 4 shows that the fibers 13 extend *over and into* liquid passages 6. Thus it is respectfully submitted that Takai fails to disclose in any manner a material including an adhesive disposed on a first surface of the material, a plurality of apertures that are arranged *in an area not patterned with the adhesive, and flocked fibers applied to said adhesive composition* in the manner of the claimed invention. It is also submitted that Gibes fails to disclose any such structure.

In view of the above it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 7 is patentable over the cited references. Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 7 and thus it is submitted that these claims are also allowable for the reasons set forth above.

Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to call the applicants' undersigned representative if any further action will expedite the prosecution of the application or if the Examiner has any suggestions or questions concerning the application or the present Response. In fact, if the claims of the application are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, for any reason, the applicants respectfully request the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner in drafting one or more acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP § 707.07(j) or in making constructive suggestions pursuant to MPEP § 706.03 so that the application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

/Paul J. Higgins/

By: _____
Paul J. Higgins
Reg. No. 44,152

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-1728
Dated: November 14, 2005